

Second Member of Council.—

There is no use. There is not sufficient money.

At the end of the Question time, Mr. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY said that Subject No. 140 was of utmost importance to Chikmagalur town and that he should be permitted to speak on it, even as a special case.

No. 140—Construction of a tank near Hirekolale for improving the source of water supply to Chikmagalur town and irrigation.

Mr. M. Siddalingappa Setty, Chikmagalur Taluk.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY represented that the existing water supply to Chikmagalur town was dependent on the Yegachi stream from which water was drawn by means of cast iron pipes for the supply to the town. Owing to the low flow of water in the stream, there was not at present a sufficient supply to the town itself, while little water could be spared for irrigation purposes. He therefore requested that Government might be pleased to order the construction of a tank near Hirekolale so that it might meet the demands of both the town and the raiyats.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that action could be more easily taken if the raiyats and the municipality were prepared to pay more contribution:

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY did not see how the question of additional contribution could crop up at that stage more especially as the Dewan, during his recent tour in the taluk was quite satisfied as to the urgent need for the tank and promised favourable consideration. He added that people were suffering for want of water and that immediate action should be taken.

THE DEWAN promised to consider the question.

RESOLUTIONS.*Resolution No 1.*

MR. G. VENKATARAMANA GOWDA moved the following resolution:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that for every 100 head of cattle 50 acres of gomal may be allotted.”

In doing so he said that when the rules were at first framed, Government ordered that 30 acres of gomal should be allotted for every 100 head of cattle, and when the subject

was discussed in the Assembly some time back it was urged that 50 acres at least might be given as 30 acres were not sufficient to graze 100 head of cattle.

In seconding the resolution, Mr. PARASIVIAH stated that only good land might be allotted as it was absolutely of no use if even a large extent of kharab land was given. He added that it was far better to allot only 10 acres of fertile instead of 50 acres of useless land.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that the existing rules on the subject were quite fair and that if in any particular case, there was any difficulty, the rules provided for the grant of further concession. He did not think that the extent of gomal mattered so much as long as sufficient fodder could be obtained. Raiyats should therefore try to grow fodder in larger quantities in consultation with the Agricultural Department. In many places, the extent of banjar land was very limited and it was therefore impossible to allow more gomal in those places. But wherever possible, Government could allow larger extent under the existing rules and there was no necessity for any resolution on the subject.

Mr. H. C. DASAPPA moved the following amendment:-

"A suitable extent of gomal land may be allotted wherever possible."

He did not think that an exact extent should be specified.

Mr. LINGE GOWDA said that the resolution in the amended form might be accepted.

Mr. VENKATARAMANA GOWDA said that he did not agree to the amendment.

Mr. D. S. MALLAPPA stated that at present all good land was given away for cultivation and only banjar land was allotted as gomal and that it served no useful purpose. He requested that the raiyats' representations might be favourably considered and the land selected by them allotted for gomal.

Mr. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that even good land was given for cultivation only to the rich people. In the Anekal Taluk many plots of cultivable land which were first given to the backward community people were taken back from them and resold to the rich people. He requested that good land might be given as gomal land so that there might not be much difficulty in grazing cattle in future.

Mr. DEVE GOWDA said that when darkhasts were given for want of lands, the Sheikdar should be made responsible to see that gomal land was not given away for cultivation.

MR. NAGAPPA SETTY said that there was not much difficulty in the Malnad in regard to gomal.

MR. VEERE GOWDA said that in many villages there was not a single acre of gomal and consequently some rich raiyats had to grow grass in their own cultivable lands. But the poorer people could not do similarly and there would be no fodder for their cattle. Hence he wanted assessed waste lands to be set apart for gomal in places where the extent of gomal was insufficient.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the existing practice in regard to gomal was quite satisfied. Gomal lands were not sold unless the raiyats agreed and also not until complaints, if any, were heard and disposed of.

MR. VEERE GOWDA said that the existing rules regarding the grant of gomal lands were not strictly observed and that gomal lands were given away to influential persons, without a majority of raiyats knowing anything at all about such disposal.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER observed that in such cases the raiyats could appeal to the higher authorities.

MR. RAMASWAMI suggested that a policy should be laid down by Government according to which a definite extent of gomal land should be set apart in every village according to its needs.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that this could not be done. He stated that cultivable land could not be given for gomal purposes.

MR. VENKATASAMI GOWDA said that at present the lands given as gomal were only rocky and that nothing but lantana and prickly pear grew in them. He said that during the time of Sir M. Visvesvaraya a promise was held out that the villagers could use the village forests for gomal purposes but that it was not given effect to. He was of opinion that the Village Forest Regulation should be strictly enforced. He said that ordinarily 50 acres of gomal were not at all necessary unless it be for the use of goats.

MR. SEETHARAMIAH said that it was not possible to agree to the resolution. Ordinarily, he said, in some villages there might be 1,000 head of cattle and if 500 acres of land were given away as gomal, no land would be available for cultivation. At the same time he said that Government also would lose kandayam and the people would not get enough food to live upon. He was of opinion that in the irrigated area, there was no need to set apart more than 5 acres for gomal.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that as already stated by him, the existing rules were quite fair and that if in any particular case there was difficulty for cattle and if a representation was made to Government for the grant of more gomal land, the same would be favourably considered. He further remarked that it was not possible to accept the resolution as it stood.

MR. VENKATARAMANA GOWDA said, that in that case he would agree to modify his resolution by substituting "wherever possible."

THE DEWAN said that the resolution would be accepted if the words "wherever possible" were inserted.

Resolution No. 2.

MR. VENKATAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"That this assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that Kannada be adopted as the medium of instruction in all Secondary Schools of the State."

In doing so he said that this subject had been discussed on many occasions before and that on the present occasion he wanted to impress on the minds of all the members present, the necessity for imparting instruction in the vernacular of the country. He deplored the fact that having been born and bred up in a Kannada country, the people had been reduced to the condition of asking the Government to give their children education in the vernacular of their country. He quoted an extract from the Young India wherein Mahatma Gandhi said:—

"Among the many evils of Foreign Rule this blighting imposition of a foreign medium upon the youth of the country will be counted by history as one of the greatest. It has sapped the energy of the nation. It has shortened the lives of pupils, it has estranged them from the masses and it has made education unnecessarily expensive. If this process is still persisted in, it bids fair to rob the nation of its soul. The sooner therefore educated India shakes itself free from the hypnotic spell of the foreign medium, the better it would be for them and the people."

He then quoted passages from the writings of some great men on the same subject. The opinion of Mr. Ali Akbar who made a special study of Reformatory Schools in England and Education in Germany said:—

"The capacity for original thought among the graduates of the Indian Universities is generally poor, because

their best energies have been spent on the mechanical attempt to acquire the power of expression in a foreign language. The efforts they have to make in trying to master the intricacies of foreign grammar and idiom prevent them from paying undivided attention to a study of the subject. The result is that their minds are filled with words and all these difficulties lead them to memorize long passages out of the book; and needless to say this practice of cramming produces a most detrimental effect on their intellectual powers.

"If you want a nation to imbibe more liberal ideas and adopt more liberal methods, you must train its minds effectively, but such moral training is not possible under a system of education which is under the sway of a foreign medium of instruction. It is only when vernaculars are rescued from the neglect into which they have fallen and are made the vehicles of knowledge that India can cultivate her national genius."

He then quoted from Mr. Tilak who said:—

"In spite of a long stay in India, no European can speak for a couple of hours fluent Marathi, while our graduates are required as a rule to obtain proficiency in the English language. One who speaks and writes good English is said, in these days, to have been educated. Such a compulsion for the study of foreign languages does not exist anywhere except in India. We spend twenty or twenty five years for the education which we can easily obtain in seven or eight years if we get it through the medium of our vernaculars. We cannot help learning English; but there is no reason why its study be made compulsory. Under the Mahommedan rule, we were required to learn Persian but we were not compelled to study it. To save unnecessary waste of time, we have proposed to give Education through our own vernaculars."

MR. VENKATAPPA said that many English writers were of the same opinion in regard to the medium of instruction.

He then referred to the questionnaire issued by the late Mysore Chronicle and the replies received thereto, in the course of which, the present Director of the Indian Institute of Science, Dr. Forster, had also stated that it was possible to give education in Kannada even in Colleges. When such authorities were in favour of the vernacular language and when Mysore had its own University, he thought it was sad to think that no attempt was made to adopt Kannada as the medium of instruction in Mysore. In support of his argument that it was possible to impart

instruction in the vernacular even in the Colleges, he said that in the Oosmania College and also in the Women's College at Poona, instruction was given in the vernacular.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL asked whether all the people in Mysore spoke Kannada.

MR. VENKATAPPA replied that it was almost so and urged that the resolution might be accepted and that for the present Kannada language might be adopted in the Secondary Schools.

MR. DEVA GOWDA seconded the resolution. He stated that at present no student could talk pure Kannada and that in course of time that language was in danger of completely dying out. He observed that the boys in lower classes could not follow their teachers when they taught them in English and the teachers could not teach in Kannada. The result was that a mixed language of both Kannada and English was used. He said that this was a pitiable situation in the Mysore State. Even graduates talked and corresponded in Marathi in Poona. The member therefore requested that the resolution might be accepted.

MR. SITHARAMIAH also supported the resolution. He said that the boys felt real difficulty in understanding scientific books written in English.

THE DEWAN remarked that this subject had been discussed many a time already.

MR. SITHARAMIAH said that in spite of it Government had not yet taken it into their mind to introduce Kannada as the medium of instruction. He understood the difficulties of the Government in taking such a step. The first was that there were many vernaculars in the country. But he thought that objection did not affect Mysore where Kannada was the only vernacular spoken by a large majority of the people. Secondly, there was the difficulty of securing books written in Kannada. This also was untenable as the resolution referred only to the high school standard and there were books suitable for that standard. Moreover, there were many people who were able to translate the text-books into Kannada if only proper encouragement was given to them.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired how the member proposed to deal with the Urdu Schools.

MR. SITHARAMIAH suggested that Kannada might be made compulsory even in Urdu schools in the earlier classes.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was not so easy, for, if Kannada was made the medium, the Examinations also should be held in Kannada, and in that case the

Mahomedan students would not be able to have the same facility as the students of other communities would have.

MR. SITHARAMIAH said that even under the existing conditions there were many Mahomedans who spoke Kannada very well. He said that even they would be up to the mark if only Kannada was taught compulsorily from the beginning of their education. If that was not possible, he requested that Kannada might be made compulsory in all the other schools. He did not mean that English should be boycotted. That language was also necessary but preference to the Kannada language should be given. If Kannada were made the predominant language and should be made the medium of instruction, Kannada literature would improve and it would facilitate the writing of more Kannada books on higher technical subjects.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR said that he had an amendment to the resolution as under:—

At the end of the resolution add the words “and as a compulsory subject in all primary classes in the State.”

MR. VENKATAPPA said that he accepted the amendment.

MR. BHASHYAM IYENGAR said that Kannada should be taught in all primary schools.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that except in Urdu schools Kannada was being taught in all primary schools.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR observed that more than 80 per cent of Mahomedan brethren were talking Kannada. He was of opinion that every one in Mysore should know Kannada if he should be true to his citizenship, and that Mahomedans too should learn it. For instance, if a Mahomedan was appointed as a judge, Kannada was inevitable for him. In the same way, in several capacities a knowledge of Kannada was essential even to Mahomedans. He therefore proposed that Kannada should be made compulsory in all primary schools. If it was not taught, there, he said that it could not be learnt afresh in higher schools.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that in Hyderabad, although several languages were spoken, yet Urdu was compulsory.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether it was not for Government business alone and whether it was compulsory in the schools also.

MR. SANJEEVIAH said that although Urdu was not made directly compulsory, it had been indirectly made so as all correspondence was carried on in that language. In that

way, people were compelled to learn Urdu if they wanted to get through their work.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that just in the same way, people would themselves learn Kannada in Mysore if they wanted it. He did not think that they should be compelled to learn that language.

MR. SANJEEVIAH said that it was exactly what he also wanted. He said that instead of making Kannada language compulsory in schools, it might be adopted as the medium of correspondence in all offices. By doing so, the students would be compelled to learn that language.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL asked whether all students who studied in Government schools went in for Government appointments.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that that was not necessary. Even if people wanted to mix and move with one another, he said, that there should be a common language.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that that was left to their option.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH urged that simply because some people were inconvenienced it was not right to let many other persons suffer. He said that Kannada should be made a compulsory subject and that all the subjects should be taught in that language.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was not possible to take one subject and leave out the others.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH said that Kannada might be made optional to Mahomedans just as Sanskrit and other vernacular languages are made optional.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was not possible to treat all the subjects as optionals.

MR. B. L. BYANNA said that so far as he could see the opinion of the Assembly and of the Government was one and the same. He said that he was aware of many Urdu schools which indented for Kannada teachers. He said that the only difficulty which Government could put forward was that of finance. Even this, he said, could be overcome by gradually introducing Kannada language, firstly in all primary schools, secondly, in all middle schools, thirdly, in all secondary schools and so on. He said that if only Government made up their mind, this object could be achieved without any difficulty and within a short time.

MR. SUBBARAMA CHETTY thought that by introducing Kannada in Urdu schools the Mahomedans would be enabled to speak Kannada better.

Mr. SIDDALINGA DEVARU said that the major communities should look after the interests of the smaller communities and that the latter should not be allowed to sacrifice the interests of the former. The Mysore people were pre-eminently Kannada speaking people and those that could not speak Kannada were later immigrants. If they should live in a spirit of brotherliness in Mysore, they should be compelled to learn Kannada which was the chief language of the country. He thought that by the advent of English, Kannada was in danger of losing its hold on the people. He feared that as matters stood, Mysore had no national respect for Kannada which it once commanded. He was emphatically of opinion that every thing should be done to restore Kannada to its lost position in the consciousness of the people. The Government should not be influenced by the considerations of the minorities who could not speak Kannada. All other considerations should be subordinated to the one of national importance. Even in the case of minor communities, he did not think that there was any fear of their losing the respect for their own mother-tongue by learning Kannada. Kannada required and deserved all the stimulus which Government could give it. He wanted even the Mysore University to be converted into a Kannada University. All that was done in the country should be made known through Kannada. In short Kannada should be made compulsory in the case of all people, irrespective of caste or creed. For these reasons, he supported the resolution.

Mr. ABBAS KHAN said that Mr. Siddalinga Devaru made a reference to Mahomedans, saying that they had come from outside and were in a minority. He asked whether the majority could dictate so as to offend against the susceptibilities of the minorities. Supposing to-morrow the majority say that the mosques were a source of trouble to them and might be done away with, could they, he asked, be abolished at one stroke. In regard to the language question just as Mysore Hindus wanted Kannada the Muslims preferred Urdu. He said that he would leave it to the major communities to consider whether they were right in asking minor communities to give up their own mother-tongue in preference to the Kannada language.

Mr. VENKATAPPA said that no one had expressed such an opinion.

Mr. ABBAS KHAN continuing said that it was not possible for their children to learn several languages while

they were very young. There were about 1,000 Urdu schools in the State and about 40,000 boys reading in them. If Kannāda were to be made the medium of instruction he asked what would become of the position of Hindustani boys appearing for Lower Secondary Examination. At present they had to read four languages in the Lower primary classes. At this stage it was not possible to introduce a fifth language in their curriculum of instruction. There were many difficulties in the way of introducing Kannāda as a compulsory language. He was for referring the question to a committee. If in spite of all this it was found necessary that Kannāda should be introduced, it could be made only as an optional subject but not as a compulsory subject.

MR. K. SRIKANTAIYA said that the arguments which Mr. Abbas Khan had urged with reference to Urdu also applied to other languages like the Telugu and that if Kannāda were made the common language the Telugu speaking people would also labour under similar difficulties.

MR. RAMESWARA SASTRI said that the same arguments would apply to Tamil also.

MR. ABBAS KHAN said that persons speaking Tamil were a small number. If this resolution were passed it would inconvenience the Mahommedan boys far more than others and hence Government should not accept the resolution to make Kannāda language compulsory. In any case provision should be made as at present for Muslim boys and girls to be taught in Urdu. He said that Mahommedans wishing to enter Government service might be compelled to learn and possess a knowledge of Kannāda. He could not understand what advantage would be gained by requiring all Mahommedan students to learn Kannāda. It would be of no use to a trader. Just as Hindus paid more attention to the Kannāda language the Mussalmans cared much for Urdu. The Muhomedans were quite loyal to His Highness the Maharaja to whom they looked forward to protect their own language as a medium of instruction in their schools and not relegate it to a secondary place.

MR. RANOJI RAO while supporting the resolution said that while it was not possible to establish schools classwar, it could be done languagewar. The subject of this resolution came before the Education Board when Dr. Seal said that Kannāda should be taught compulsorily in the 3rd and 4th standards. Messrs. Abbas Khan and Kalami explained their own point of view and objected to the proposal. They

said that the relegation of the Urdu language to a secondary place would not make for unity among them. Mr. Randji Rao however did not agree with this view. In Mysore Kannada was the predominant language. It was the language of the majority of the people. Hence a knowledge of Kannada was essential to all people in addition to their own respective mother-tongues. If Hindu-Muslim unity was to be real there should be a common tie between them. The Muslims must have facilities to learn Kannada and the knowledge embodied in the Kannada works so as to facilitate a free interchange of thought between the two communities.

MR. ABDUL RAHIMAN said that they had an English-University and that if Kannada were made the medium of instruction then a Kannada University would have to be established. He did not object to it. He did not say that education in Urdu schools should be given in Urdu alone in all the classes, and that no other language should be taught. But the main difficulty was that the pupils should compulsorily learn Urdu, Arabic and English and whether they would be able to learn four languages compulsorily was a matter for consideration. If this was insisted upon he feared that Mahomedan boys would have no education worth the name. If a particular language was necessary for a particular business they would by all means learn it. But there was no necessity to insist upon introducing Kannada in Urdu schools. He therefore prayed that the existing state of things might be allowed to continue so far as Muslims were concerned.

MR. RAMDOSS said that it was difficult to insist on all students to learn Kannada.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR then explained that what he said was that every one should learn Kannada without sacrificing his own mother-tongue.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA also expressed the same view. While there were wranglings like this as to which language should be the medium of instruction the imparting of instruction in English was going on uninterruptedly. It so happened that while foreigners were trying to learn the Kannada language and study the works written in Kannada the local people themselves were quite apathetic. His main point was that the Muslim brethren should also learn Kannada without neglecting their own language so that there might be harmony between the two communities.

MR. PUTTASWAMI said that Mr. Siddalinga Devaru's object was that more prominence should be given to Kannada

only and not that other languages should be neglected. No Hindu would say that a Mahomedan should give up his mother tongue. Each class favours its own language. The growth of the language was an index of the growth of the nation. There were impediments to the growth of Kannada language which in his opinion should be removed. If Kannada were taught in the early stages to a student, there was a chance of his gaining proficiency in it later. Recently there had been agitation for making Hindi an All-India language. It was completely new to Mysore and if the people learnt that language also they would be all the better for it. If there should be peace and unity in the land there should be one common language and for mass education Kannada was best of all languages in Mysore.

MR. SOMASEKHARA RAO said that the object of the resolution was not to bring any disunion among Hindu and Mahomedans. Nobody had said that Urdu should not be taught. There was a movement everywhere to make Hindi an All-India language. That did not mean that Urdu should disappear. If there was to be an exception in the case of people speaking Urdu there were other people who spoke Telugu, Tamil, Marati, etc., to whom also the exception might apply. He agreed with the sentiment expressed by Mr. Abbas Khan that major sections should protect the rights of minorities. There were so many Mahomedans who could not understand Kannada. There should be no room for such a state of affairs. Hence the resolution might be accepted.

MR. MAHAMMAD HUSSAIN of Hunsur put forward the same views as those urged by Mr. Abbas Khan and opposed the resolution.

MR. B. S. LINGE GOWDA also opposed the resolution. His own view was that the people should be a nation first and Hindus next. Besides there were days of unemployment when Mysore youths had to go outside the State in search of careers. If, therefore, Mysore boys knew only Kannada they would be hard put to understand the languages prevailing elsewhere. He was also afraid that by making Kannada the medium of instruction in the lower classes it would be difficult for boys to get on later when they went to the University.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that Mahomedans were not foreigners to India. The only point was that Kannada being the State language it should be learnt by everybody. There might be some difficulty in making Kannada a medium

of instruction in High School classes because in the Colleges they had to learn everything in English. The Sadler Committee also said that vernacular should be the medium of instruction. He rather thought that it was very difficult all at once to introduce Kannada compulsorily. It could be done only gradually. There might be some difficulty in teaching Science and other subjects in Kannada. For the present option might be given to the candidates to answer their papers either in English or in the vernacular. For these reasons he thought that the appointment of a committee as suggested was necessary.

MR. VENKATA REDDI said that Kannada was the language favoured by the Royal House of Mysore and that the late Krishnarajendra Wadiyar, the grandfather of the present Maharaja, was signing in Kannada. It was a language of the majority of the people and he thought that it should be taught compulsorily.

MR. MAHOMED SAIT said that it was difficult to insist upon Mahommedans to learn Kannada in addition to other languages. Hindustani was known and spoken almost everywhere in India but Kannada was not known perhaps beyond Jalarpet. The Mahommedans could not give up their mother-tongue in favour of Kannada. If anybody wanted to learn Kannada there was no objection to his doing it. It should not be imposed on the entire community compulsorily. Further, there were no books in Kannada for higher classes and it would take a considerable time before these books could be got ready. He pleaded that Mahommedans might not be placed in an unfair position.

MR. MIRLE LAKSHMINARANAPPA said that at present Mussalmans were learning both English and Urdu. He thought that less attention might be devoted to English and more attention given to Kannada. For standardising education there should be a single medium of instruction.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that the real difficulty was to learn through a foreign language. This should be avoided, and it was only with this object the resolution and the amendment were brought up. He hoped that a committee would be appointed to consider the question as to how best to give effect to the resolution.

MR. GOPALACHAR said that Kannada was being neglected more and more. He was of opinion that by amalgamating Kannada and Urdu schools not only the Mahommedans could learn Kannada better, but also, it would lead to Hindu-Muslim unity.

MR. NABI KHAN said that Mahomedan boys had now to learn Persian, Arabic, English and Urdu and there was no escape from it. If Kannada were made compulsory they had to learn a fifth language at a very tender age. What a strain that would be on the boys could best be imagined. The object of the resolution was to ensure that everyone should know Kannada. As it was, more than 95 per cent of Mussalmans knew Kannada and there was no necessity for compulsion at all. Again His Highness had conveyed his Silver Jubilee message in Urdu also and that showed that His Highness had respect for Urdu in common with Kannada.

MR. TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN said that if Kannada was made compulsory, it would be difficult for the children of the Mahomedans to learn it along with other languages, so that they would neither learn the one nor the other. If the medium of instruction was changed in the way proposed, he feared that University courses would be unduly prolonged. Hence the question bristled with difficulties and a committee might be appointed to go into the whole question.

Referring to the argument that in the interests of the problem of unemployment and of boys joining the colleges elsewhere, English alone should be made the medium of instruction in preference to Kannada.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA said that the purpose would be equally served if English were made an optional language and Kannada compulsory. Again if Kannada was difficult for Mahomedans, English would not be less difficult. Hence he thought that more attention might be paid in Urdu schools to Kannada than English.

MR. RAZVI said that the resolution together with the amendment would render the position very difficult for the Mahomedans. If Kannada was to be made compulsory in primary classes and a medium of instruction in high school classes, it would be making the courses unduly heavy. Either the one or the other must be given up. Mahatma Gandhi had said that Hindi must be *lingua franca* of India. If that came to pass there would be no need to have Kannada at all. Hence he suggested that Hindi might be introduced in Mysore as the medium of instruction. As a better alternative he would suggest that both communities might learn Kannada and Urdu together. Let Hindus learn Urdu and Mahomedans Kannada. The resolution with the amendment had in his opinion no meaning.

In replying to the debate MR. VENKATAPPA said that there was not much opposition to the resolution. A few

Mahomedan members said that if Kannada was made compulsory, one more language would be added to the list of languages which their boys had at present to learn. But he asked, were they not learning English now compulsorily? While His Highness had himself learnt the Urdu language, why should not Mahomedans learn Kannada? He said that in the heat of the discussion the real point was missed. It was admitted that every one should love his own mother-tongue. But what he urged was that Kannada being the State language should also be made compulsory in Mysore. On the question of advantages accruing to the Mahomedans by learning Kannada he quoted from a speech delivered by Sir Gulam Hidayatulla on the subject of mixed schools. Sir Gulam said "Let there be a single set of schools for Mahomedan and Hindu boys. Let there be Urdu teachers separately appointed also to teach Urdu language. There, our boys can rub shoulders with the boys of the other communities. And this healthy rivalry is all to the good. It is there that we learn to appreciate one another's good qualities and virtues and to allow for one another's feelings and foibles. It is the easiest and most natural means of solving the one great problem of the day, the relations between the two main communities in India." Such a system the speaker thought would not only benefit the State in the long run but serve the best interests of the language of the country. With reference to the objection raised by Mr. B. S. Linge Gowda on the effect the acceptance of this resolution would have on the boys when they went to the University, he said that it had been amply proved beyond doubt that there would be no sort of difficulty at all. In support of this statement he quoted from Barnard Shaw who said, "There is no such thing as ideally correct English. No two British subjects speak exactly alike. In London nine hundred and ninety nine out of every thousand not only speak bad English but speak even that very badly."

Mr. Venkatappa therefore thought that no one need trouble about boys speaking bad English. When Kannadigas were not ashamed to speak bad Kannada, there was no reason why they should be ashamed if they spoke bad English. There was a wider movement on foot to secure unification of the entire Kannada country with Kannada as the sole medium of instruction. This being so, Mysore should not lag behind other Kannada speaking countries. Messrs. Matthan and N. S. Subba Rao had expressed the opinion that an attempt might be made in this direction. Why should not a

beginning be made at present? There was really no difference of opinion on the subject matter of the resolution which he commended to the acceptance of the House.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that there could hardly be any difference of opinion as to the desirability of making the vernacular the medium of instruction. There was much loss of time and effort in learning every subject through a foreign medium. If Kannada were made the medium of instruction, the progress of the boys would have been far greater. The Education Department had under its consideration the idea of introducing a vernacular medium. When he was Director, he wished to give some practical effect to this idea but he found that there were many difficulties. The vernacular could not be made the medium of instruction all at once. It must proceed by stages. It was not merely the difficulties on account of the vernacular of the Mahomedan population being different from the main vernacular, but there were other circumstances to be taken into consideration. In the first place, it was doubtful whether the present class of High School teachers were competent to teach all subjects in Kannada and in the second place, there were no suitable text books in the case of most subjects. The first step to be taken was to have suitable text books in Kannada on History, Science, etc., prepared. This was under the consideration of the department. Uniformity of terminology has to be secured. For this the compilation of an English-Kannada lexicon is under consideration. Then there is the difficulty as regards the Mahomedans. At present, up to the middle schools they learn in Urdu and it would be difficult for them to suddenly take up Kannada in high schools. The amendment to the resolution sought to minimise the difficulty. He felt sure that in the interest of the progress of the State the Mussalmans should not object to the adoption of a reform considered necessary on educational grounds for the great majority of the population. But he did not think it was right to talk of compelling a whole population to take to another language. It was also not practicable to make Kannada compulsory in all Urdu schools, particularly in the primary classes: because it was not possible to get a sufficient number of teachers who knew both Urdu and Kannada. But, as far as possible, facilities had to be provided for the teaching of Kannada in the Urdu schools and, to this end, it was intended to prescribe Kannada as an optional subject in Urdu middle schools. Government intended to take suitable action in this regard early. It

might entail an expenditure of Rs. 10,000 a year to appoint Kannada Munshis for all Urdu middle schools. It was under contemplation to make some provision on this account in the next budget. It would thus be seen that Government were no less anxious than the people in adopting the vernacular as the medium of instruction. But action could only be gradual. Even if the resolution was passed, it could not be given effect to immediately.

The members might take it that Government did not propose to put off this matter till doomsday but intended to make a beginning as soon as circumstances permitted.

MR. VENKATAPPA said that the principles of the resolution might at least be accepted.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the Government accepted the principle of the resolution.

At this stage the Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3-45 P.M.

MESSRS. VENKATAPPA and BHASHYAM IYENGAR urged that the resolution might be put to vote.

THE DEWAN informed the members that the Government were in agreement with the suggestions embodied in the resolution and that they would be glad to give effect to them as far as possible.

Resolution No. 3

MR. B. L. BYANNA moved the following resolution:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that early steps be taken to prevent the alarming increase of beggary by able-bodied persons in the State by penalising the same by providing work-houses and infirmaries for the weak and disabled and by passing legislative measures licensing religious mendicants.”

In doing so, he stated that the beggar problem had become a common complaint, that the aged, disabled and the weak were very few, that the majority of the beggars in the State were able-bodied persons who were found loitering in the streets and before houses under the guise of fakirs, that what they earned, they would spend in drinking, smoking and other vices, that they were making this as a profession and committed thefts at night and that therefore a legislative measure might be introduced to prevent the able-bodied persons from begging and that work-houses might be pro-

vided wherein they should be forced to do work, and infirmaries opened for the weak and disabled. He submitted his motion for kind acceptance.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA CHETTY seconded the resolution. He said that beggars were increasing day by day and that it was a menace to the prosperity of the country.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved the following amendment to the resolution:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that early steps be taken to prevent beggary by able-bodied persons in the State.”

He said that the words “alarming increase of” and the words “by penalising the same by providing work-houses and infirmaries for the weak and disabled and by passing legislative measures licensing religious mendicants” might be omitted. He was of opinion that a committee might be appointed, their views taken and a Bill brought before the Representative Assembly. He thought that infirmaries and work-houses would mean a large amount of expenditure and he doubted whether this was possible under the existing financial circumstances.

The object of the amendment, he added, was to widen the scope of the resolution, and take away any restriction in regard to the liberty of action on the part of Government to adequately solve the beggar problem.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA seconded the amendment.

THE DEWAN observed that it was not a measure of practical utility and that the burden would largely fall upon the people.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY said the Municipality might maintain a register of beggars and set apart a definite portion of the assessment received by them towards their maintenance.

MR. VEMA REDDY said that according to the *shastrās* alms-giving was a sacred duty and that there was nobody who could say that he became poor by giving alms. After all, he added, charity was optional and that already very few allowed beggars to approach their houses and he thought that a law was not necessary.

MR. KESAVIAH in supporting the resolution said that Government had now abolished Annachatrams and saved 15,000; that there was a proposal to start one *Anatharakshaka* Home in Chickmagalur, that the District Board had agreed to pay a contribution and that similar homes might be started in other places in the State and that the Munici-

pality, the District Board and the Government might share the cost. He was of opinion that the able-bodied should be prevented from begging.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA was of opinion that if a law was at all necessary, it should be applicable only to the able-bodied beggars.

MR. A. NARAYANA IYENGAR said that there were many students who lived on charity for their education and the proposed law if applied to them would be a great hardship. Again, it would be difficult to compel every mendicant to take out a license, as many mendicants ate if they could get anything by begging or starved.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI said that begging was allowed by all communities and religions and that it would not be just for Government to put a stop to it. Moreover, beggary took many forms, one of them being collecting subscriptions from the public for some laudable cause. It would not be right to put the law in operation in such cases. He, therefore, opposed the measure.

DHARMAPRAKASA D. BANUMIA said that the beggars that were found in the streets of Mysore were generally foreigners whose object was nothing but theft and robbery. From his own experience, he could say that the Mysore Anathalaya was resorted to by more outsiders than Mysore people. Most beggars were able-bodied and took to begging on account of unemployment. He was of opinion that they should be controlled.

MR. K. SRIKANTAIYA said that the beggars abused people if alms were refused and that they were a nuisance. He favoured legislative action to control them.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA thought that in preference to passing a law, it would be better if work-houses were built for the poor as in the West and that the bigger Municipalities might establish some suitable industries for them.

MR. T. S. ALI KHAN favoured legislative action.

MESSRS. B. S. LINGE GOWDA, MANJIAH and NAGAPPA SETTY said that it was absolutely necessary to put a stop to street begging either by legislative action or by the provision of work-houses.

MR. BYANNA regretted that he could not accept the amendment and referred to a similar measure in vogue in Baroda and Calcutta and to a proposal under consideration in Bombay Corporation.

The amendment was put to vote and carried by a large majority.

Resolution No. 5.

MR. S. VENKATASAMI GOWDA moved the following resolution:—

“That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that an annual grant of Rs. 50,000 be sanctioned for each district for drinking-water wells, as the grants now sanctioned for the purpose are too inadequate to meet the needs of every district.”

In doing so, the mover added that the amount allotted should be spent only for drinking-water wells.

MR. GOPALACHAR seconded the resolution.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVE GOWDA was of opinion that the resolution would not be beneficial to the Malnad, that if Rs. 50,000 were granted by Government, it should be allowed to be spent in the Malnad on other beneficial measures and not necessarily for the definite purpose as stated in the resolution and that discretion must be left to the District Board. He, therefore, proposed the following amendment:—

After the words “drinking-water wells,” add “or other important necessities.”

Omit the words “for the purpose” after the word “sanctioned.”

Omit the word “every” after the words “needs of.”

After the word “District” add the word “Boards.”

THE DEWAN observed that they should first secure the grant before discussing the particular purpose for which it should be spent. He said that it was difficult to accept the resolution.

The resolution was, however, put to vote and carried.

Adjournment Motion.

MR. VENKATAPPA, in moving the adjournment motion, to discuss the legality of the order of the Director of Public Instruction dismissing from service six school-teachers who had affixed their signatures to the Memorial submitted to His Highness by the public of Bangalore City in connection with the recent disturbances, said that the school-masters had done nothing very serious so as to merit dismissal straightaway. Further, it was premature to judge whether the circumstances and facts narrated in the memorial were mere exaggerations and falsehoods or whether there was any truth in them. He pointed out that the memorial contained no reflection against Government, was not couched in offensive or objectionable language but was a simple recital of facts

of common knowledge. The petition merely requested His Highness to take all safeguards for the safety of the people. He was of opinion that the people, be they officials or non-officials, had a right to seek the protection of His Highness. It was understood that the teachers were dismissed as their conduct in signing the memorial came under the Public Servants Conduct Rules. As the petition was not a complaint against the official superior of these teachers or anything relating to the office in which they worked, he failed to see how the Public Servants Conduct Rules applied to the case. The whole affair connected with the disturbances, he continued, was still under inquiry, and it was not proper on the part of the department to have taken such drastic action against the poor school-masters. It was a wonder to him why only these six teachers were dismissed while there were other Government servants who had signed the memorial without giving their official designation but had not been similarly dealt with. He asked whether it was because they had been truthful in indicating their designation also. In these circumstances he pressed the motion for the acceptance of the House, and for the cancellation of the dismissal order.

At the request of Mr. H. C. Dasappa, THE DEWAN permitted Mr. Venkatappa to read the Memorial in question.

MR. SATYANARAYANASETTY in seconding the motion said that the Public Servants' Conduct Rules did not debar Government servants from submitting memorials to His Highness. They referred only to memorials to Government. He thought that it was the birthright of every citizen to approach His Highness and that this privilege could not be taken away by the Government under cover of Public Servants' Conduct Rules. Also, there was nothing in the memorial to which exception could be taken. When public life and property were at stake, and when the people had grave apprehensions that Government were not promptly taking action to bring the situation under control, it was but right on their part to have memorialised His Highness, and the school-masters, being human beings after all, had committed no great mistake by affixing their signatures to the memorial. He therefore thought that the dismissal order was not correct and urged for its cancellation.

MR. N. G. SANJIVIAH said that the only point for consideration was whether the teacher-students had a right to petition to His Highness in the particular circumstances of the case. The petition arose within 15 days of the occurrence, and in the meantime Government proclaimed the appointment

of an Additional District Magistrate, a Committee of Inquiry and also took many other steps to allay public anxiety. Even after such action had been taken, the teacher-students without verifying the statements mentioned in the petition affixed their signatures. The petition was largely against the conduct of Government in the Bangalore Disturbances and as such it was altogether wrong to complain against the Government even after they had taken all reasonable steps in the matter. He did not think that a police constable merely imagining some trouble could send in a petition to His Highness straightaway. Mr. Satyanarayana Setty said that it was the birthright of every citizen to petition to His Highness. The particular petition in question was one stating that the people had lost confidence in the Government and in the Dewan. He was doubtful whether there was real occasion to write such a petition. He was of opinion that as soon as a person entered Government service he lost all his rights of private citizenship. In this view he thought that the teacher-students had no right to assert the same rights which the ordinary private citizens enjoyed. He thought that the petition was of a political nature and would necessarily come under the Public Servants Conduct Rules. Government servants could not take part in any political movement and it was for that reason that they were debarred from standing for elections. Such a petition could be submitted only when the country was in a state of chaos, the Government had ceased to function and the welfare of the people was at stake.

Referring to the contents of the petition itself he said that they were undoubtedly seditious and contained many allegations against Government. He was against any Government servant taking part in the getting up of a petition of this kind or in affixing his signature to it. It was stated that many other teachers had also signed the memorial without indicating their official designation and that they had not been dismissed. He thought that the Government would do everything to see that such officials were traced and dealt with. He did not agree with Mr. Satyanarayana Setty in the view that life and property of the public of Bangalore were in any grave peril.

It was also a point for consideration whether any leaders of the people signed the memorial. His own opinion was that most leaders abstained from signing it. He understood that signatures to the memorial were not taken in an open fashion but that everything was done in a stealthy manner. The teachers themselves were not summarily dis-

missed without calling for an explanation from them. Their explanation was certainly far from satisfactory. They said that in view of a particular dictum laid down by the Chairman of the Inquiry Committee they did not think that they committed anything wrong in signing the memorial. This explanation was intolerable. In future they might say that the Government committed a wrong because somebody else said it was wrong. If such a conduct was tolerated all Government would be at an end. Such a conduct in his view should be characterised as gross insubordination. He thought that if their conduct was condoned in the present instance people would lose all confidence in Government. He said in conclusion that the action of the teachers was quite wrong and indefensible and that unless they tendered an unqualified apology, the order passed against them by the Director should not be reconsidered.

MR. N. S. SUBBA RAO said that it was unnecessary to draw attention to the statements made in the memorial as Mr. Venkatappa had read the full text of it. What he wished to emphasise was only the impropriety of the action of the teachers in having signed the memorial. He did not wish to discuss whether the things mentioned in the memorial were correct or not. He read out the letter calling for the explanation of the teachers for having signed the memorial and their reply. Three of them replied that they did not disobey the orders of Government, that thousands of people had signed the memorial, that they did not know that the memorial should have gone through the Department and that if the Inquiry Committee and the public thought that their action was objectionable, they would then offer an apology. He added that one teacher had taken back his letter stating that he would submit an explanation but so far no explanation had been received from him.

In reply to Mr. Venkatesiah's question whether they were asked to tender an apology in any particular form, the Director said that they had been asked to admit their mistake and were even given one week's time to do so. As they failed to tender the apology within the time allowed, they were dismissed. The teachers had to handle youngsters and if they themselves disobeyed the orders of their superiors, they could not be expected to instil the ideas of obedience into the minds of their pupils. Such a conduct would have a very bad influence on the boys and he thought that it should not be allowed in the best interests of the boys themselves.

MR. B. L. BYANNA thought that the order of dismissal was a misapplication of the rules. The rules did not specifically say that it was wrong to submit memorials to His Highness. It was necessary to consider the occasion which led to the memorial, at a time when the public mind was much agitated over the insecurity of life and property.

As citizens, they had also the right to submit a memorial in regard to incidents which they believed to be true.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the only question involved was whether being Government officials, the teachers could sign the memorial.

MR. B. L. BYANNA said, that granting that the teachers had committed a mistake they had done it perhaps, unknowingly and might therefore be excused. There were also cases in which Government themselves had committed mistakes.

THE DEWAN asked the speaker to resume his seat, remarking that by such statements he would be giving his case away.

MR. NAGAPPASETTY said that there was no use discussing this subject at great length. It involved only two points: firstly whether the action of the teachers was correct and secondly whether there was any necessity to approach His Highness direct. If the teachers had any grievance personally, they were at liberty to do so through the Director of Public Instruction. He thought that the action of the teachers as Government servants was a clear case of disobedience to constituted authority and that it was not right on the part of the members of the Assembly to interfere in the matter.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA, while thanking Mr. Venkappa for having so kindly read the memorial, said that references had been made in the course of it to want of confidence in the Government, action of the Director himself, incorrect statements in the Government Communiques, want of confidence in the Additional District Magistrate and the Enquiry Committee, the Police refusing to entertain complaints and the delicacy to approach the Dewan he himself being a Mahomedan, etc. After all, he said, that teachers were the subordinates of the Education Department. In regard to what was said in the memorial about want of confidence in the Government, Mr. Mallappa said that it was not his business to examine whether the allegations were true or false; what he was concerned with specially was whether Government officials were right in putting their signatures to a document containing such

objectionable sentiments. It was a different matter, if the teachers themselves were wounded. But it was not so, as a matter of fact. It was also impertinent on the part of teachers when the Director had called for their explanation to have said "Let the Inquiry Committee and the public decide whether our action was proper or not." He did not therefore think that the Director's action in dismissing them was wrong. Even granting they had a right to petition His Highness, he said, that there had happened nothing so grave as to have necessitated representation to His Highness on the part of the public at large and more so on the part of the teachers under question. He said that the trouble had not been peculiar to the Mysore State, but that such things had occurred in many other places also. And at no other place, so far as he remembered, such a petition had been addressed to the highest authority. If the teachers' even now should apologise for their wrong action, he requested that Government might sympathetically reconsider the matter. In these circumstances he requested the mover to withdraw his motion.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO thanked the Dewan for having allowed the adjournment motion to be discussed by the Assembly. He said he was not going to embarrass the Government in any way. It was not possible to discuss the matter in detail in view of the fact that the whole question connected with the disturbance was before the Inquiry Committee. He said that it was admitted that it was not merely a departmental grievance. If that were so, this question would not have come before the Assembly at all for discussion. The Public Servants' Conduct Rules prohibited officials from submitting a petition direct to Government but not to His Highness. It was the birth-right of every citizen to petition direct to His Highness. Even Sir M. Visvesvaraya had publicly given expression to the same opinion while taking evidence. He did not think that any action against the teachers should be taken before the report of the Enquiry Committee was received. Many teachers might have signed the memorial, of whom only six had been traced, and if all of them should be similarly dismissed, it would be very hard on them.

THE DEWAN observed that the Government did not mind what the number was. The teachers should either apologise or get dismissed.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO continuing further urged that it was a great constitutional question and could not be

dealt with off-hand. The people's point of view should be carefully considered and if, by sheer force, it was held that an official had no right to memorialise His Highness direct, that would be something like snatching away his birth-right from him. He added that it would be an act of terrorism on the part of Government to create a sort of fear in the minds of the people by such proceedings as had been taken against the school-masters. He therefore pressed the motion for the acceptance of the House.

THE DEWAN enquired if the speaker justified the action of the teachers.

MR. KRISHNA RAO replied that the time when the memorial was signed should be considered. He appealed to the Dewan to see that the privilege of sending memorials to the fountain head of justice was not taken away even from officials.

Many of the other members agreed with Mr. D. S. Mallappa and said that the question would automatically find a solution if only the teachers should even now tender their apology. They had committed a grave mistake by subscribing to the public agitation against the Government and that there were no two opinions on this point. They urged that a further opportunity should be given to the teachers to tender an apology and be reinstated.

MR. RANOJI RAO said that there was a good deal of difference between a Government officer and a private citizen. A Government officer was in receipt of a salary from Government revenues and besides enjoyed leave, pension and other privileges. Since he himself was a Government officer he knew something of the rules, etc., governing the conduct of public servants. In the petition submitted to His Highness he said the point to be examined was whether it contained sentiments affecting the prestige of the Government. He felt convinced, that the school-masters being in the pay of the Government had no business to sign the memorial and that, by signing it, they had laid themselves open to the punishment prescribed in the Rules. If every Government official should take it into his head to petition to His Highness direct there would be an end of all discipline and no Government worth the name could tolerate such a lapse. For these reasons he upheld the view that the attitude of the teachers was most objectionable and did not deserve to be supported by the Assembly.

MR. SUBBARAMASETTY said that simply because a man had joined Government service it did not mean that he had

surrendered his right of citizenship. He retained at all times his inherent right of petitioning to his Sovereign. Government had also permitted their officials to freely come forward and give evidence before the Enquiry Committee. Sir M. Visvesvaraya had made it plain at a sitting of the Enquiry Committee that every one irrespective of whether he was a Government official or a non-official had a right to petition to His Highness.

THE DEWAN intervening said that such a casual observation in the course of enquiry was not binding on the Government.

MR. SUBBARAMA CHETTY continuing said that it was nowhere stated in the rules that it was wrong to submit memorials to His Highness.

THE DEWAN observed that the matter was obvious and that there was no doubt about it.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH said that it should be realised first of all that there was a great difference between a Government official and a non-official. If there was no such difference, there was absolutely no use of having either the Legislative Council or the Representative Assembly. The Government existed to promote the good and safety of the people and it was but right and necessary that popular representatives should uphold the action of Government in maintaining discipline among their subordinates. He quoted what Sir Brajendralal Mitter observed in his lecture the other day at Mysore about the need for discipline among students. It was also a point for consideration whether the order of the Director of Public Instruction was final. In his opinion it was not. There was an appeal provided in the rules from the order of the Director. Instead of adopting this course, it was a mistake to have brought forward the subject for discussion at the Assembly. Some members had given expression to the fact that the right of petitioning his Sovereign was the birth-right of every citizen. It might perhaps be true. But one had to consider in what circumstances such birth-right could be exercised. He thought that so long as nothing was said or done against the Government the rights of citizenship could be exercised by Government officials. The school-masters were clearly guilty of a grave offence and had been rightly dealt with. He however requested that the teachers might be excused if they came forward with their apology and expressed regret for what they had done.

MR. S. VENKATESIAH differed from the views of Mr.

Mallappa and said that no one would deny the right of petitioning to the Sovereign, whether they were ordinary citizens or Government officials. The first point to be considered was whether the school-masters had the right of petitioning and secondly, whether the petition was modest and peaceful and whether the explanation offered by the school-masters was a modest one. Everyone had to admit that their action in this respect was questionable and that Government could not be expected to run the administration efficiently if this procedure were to be encouraged among the subordinates. Thirdly, in what condition the city was when there was a good deal of misunderstanding and excitement among the people, a petition was sent by thousands of people other than the school-masters. He thought that Government had contributed to the excitement by the dismissal of the school-masters at this time. He thought that that was not the opportunity to take action on them and create further excitement, that it was not proper that the school-masters should alone be punished severely and that it would be quite sufficient to point out their error and communicate the displeasure of the department to them.

MR. DEVE GOWDA thought that Government servants had no right like other citizens to submit memorials to His Highness. He could believe that the teachers were excited at the time of signing the memorial. But when their mistake was pointed out to them, they had no reason to be insubordinate in their reply. He had no doubt that they transgressed the departmental rules of discipline. He prayed that even if they should apologise for their conduct hereafter, they should not be treated sympathetically.

MR. DODDAIYA while agreeing with the above view said that the teachers should be the guardians of discipline and should not be permitted themselves to go against discipline.

MR. C. DEVAPPA GOWDA thought it sufficient to warn the teachers and reinstate them.

MR. ANJANEYA SETTY pleaded that the time and condition of the city, when the petition was signed should also be considered by Government. He did not understand why the Director of Public Instruction should have selected the names of certain school-masters alone and dealt with them severely excluding all others. He was sorry to see the existence of party feeling in the House. He was of opinion that this matter should not have been published at all by the Director and now that it had been done, Government should see that no further troubles arose.

MR. M. P. SOMASEKHARA RAO agreed with the mover that the action of the Director was wrong. He said that the right of petition to the Sovereign was a fundamental privilege in all well-organized countries, as the Sovereign was the fountain head of law and justice. He added that His Highness was the embodiment of truth and justice, that whoever he may be whether official or non-official, he could certainly ask for justice, that it was his birth-right, and that Government could not deprive him of that right by any rule or regulation. In this view, he thought that it was wrong to say that the teachers had no right to approach His Highness. He also contended that Rule 29 of the Public Service Conduct Rules referred to by the Director did not apply to any memorial to His Highness as the memorial therein mentioned was one for submission to Government in a matter connected with the official position of the memorialist.

THE DEWAN enquired whether in their official capacity they could criticise the action of the Government and their superior officers.

MR. SOMASEKHARA RAO replied that in that case, they could have punished the teachers on the ground of criticising their superior officers and not for sending the petition. Moreover, he said that "Government" was defined as "the person authorised to administer the executive Government in Mysore", that it meant "the Dewan" and not "His Highness the Maharaja" and that therefore it was not right to penalise the school-masters for approaching His Highness. He added further that in regard to the damaging statements contained in the memorial blaming the higher officers, these were under enquiry and might be true or false, that on the strength of these statements it was not fair to punish them. He also thought that if the statements made in the memorial were later found to be substantially true, there could be no charge against the teachers. He further said that they had only signed the memorial for which thousands had appended their signature, that on that ground if the Government dismissed them and others there would be a large number of unemployed in the State which would be unfortunate.

MR. PUTTUSWAMI stated that the first point to be considered was whether a Government servant had a right to memorialise to His Highness the Maharaja and that if he had, what sort of memorial it should be. As regards the first point he said that in Halsbury's Law of England it was stated that no Government servant had a right to petition to the Sovereign except when his life was in danger.

In the present case, it was a point for consideration whether at the time of signing the petition, the lives of these school-masters were in danger. It would be seen from the evidence tendered before Sir Visveswaraya Committee that there was no such thing affecting the lives of the school-masters in question. Referring to the sneaky suggestion made in the memorial that as the Dewan was also a Mahomedan, all the hooliganism occurred, he said that it was a most damaging statement and that it was not right on the part of the school-masters to have signed such a memorial. When once their mistake was pointed out to them, they should have apologised. When the school-masters themselves were behaving in this manner, it could easily be imagined what training they would give to their students to entitle them to become good future citizens of the country.

MR. B. CHENNABASAPPA was of opinion that if such insubordinate teachers were allowed to remain in service, it would be difficult for the department to go on. He enquired whether it was for the employment of such teachers that the people were called upon to pay education cess. He thought that the teachers should be the examples of discipline to their boys.

With reference to the contention that because there were certain damaging statements contained in the memorial against the Director of Public Instruction and the higher officers, the school-masters had therefore no right to sign the memorial, MR. M. LAKSHMINARANAPPA said that there were serious misapprehensions existing in the minds of the people then, the police and the magistracy had shown partiality in the Bangalore disturbances, that the statements contained in the memorial were still under enquiry and that supposing those statements contained were proved to be true, would it be right then on the part of the Government to penalise the school-masters for signing the memorial. He also stressed that the rules of the Government did not preclude them from signing a memorial of this nature.

MR. BHASHYAM IYENGAR remarked that it was explained by many members of this House and by the Director of Public Instruction that the Government servants should not complain against the Government in the matter of the recent Bangalore disturbances and petition to His Highness the Maharaja. The petition was addressed to His Highness the Maharaja who was the representative of God on Earth, the fountain head of truth and justice. The trouble was after all in connection with the Ganapathi idol. It was a

sorry plight that the Government servants could not worship their God, and that they should not petition to His Highness on the several alleged complaints against the Government officers in this matter of the disturbance in Bangalore City. He therefore implored the Government to cancel the dismissal.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA thought that there was no point in making a distinction between the Government and His Highness. If the motion were accepted by the House on the present occasion, it would mean that in future if any Police Inspector, or an Amildar or a Deputy Commissioner were punished, they could on every occasion petition to His Highness ignoring the Government altogether and that the members of this House could similarly bring forward every time a motion of this sort and interfere with the internal administration of the Government bringing the Government to a standstill. He failed to see the arguments of the members in favour of the motion and pointed out that if the Government had to carry on the administration fairly and justly and impartially, such a motion could not be accepted in the best interests of the State and that therefore every facility and assistance should be rendered by the people of the State to the Government in their efficient running of the administration.

He observed that the school-masters' duties were onerous, that they were responsible for the proper training of the students who would become the future citizens of the country.

Rule 28 states that a memorial from a public servant should pertain to his own individual case, that he should not jointly submit any petition and that it should be in his own writing and that it should be submitted through the official channel. The present memorial transgressed all these conditions so far as the teachers were concerned. He was emphatically of opinion that if on the present occasion the members of the House consisting of the representatives of the people allowed the dismissal order to be rescinded, it would mean that they were parties to encourage anarchy. He thought that such disobedient teachers would not improve discipline in the schools. It was necessary that every Government servant should know his limitations and obligations.

As it was 6-30 p.m. the discussion automatically stopped.

The Assembly then adjourned to 12 noon the next day.